

The Record of the Nevada Legislature for 1879.

WHAT WAS DONE ON THE CHINESE AND RAILROAD QUESTIONS!

FINANCIAL LEGISLATION!

The "Penalty" and the "Salary" Bills.

BILLS OF A GENERAL NATURE

A REVIEW OF THE WORK OF THE SESSION!

By Senator C. C. FOWNING, of Washoe.

One might as well be out of the world as out of fashion, has often been said, and it always has been the fashion to abuse a Legislature, those of the State of Nevada not excepted. The old stereotyped expressions of "The worst I ever knew," "Doing nothing," "Wish it would adjourn," are always quoted when it is in session, and when it has adjourned such as "Its power for mischief has ended," "We breathe easier," "Fell down," "The sack was too heavy," and others are published in the public prints. Some of these vile epithets have been applied to the Legislature which was in session in this State, at Carson, in January and February of this year. It is my object to let the people know just what was done by that body, telling the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, with no fear of the verdict when the record has been shown, but simply asking credit for the good, content that censure should be bestowed, if the taxpayers believe that it was false to its pledges, derelict in its duty or corrupt, extravagant instead of economical, a disgrace instead of a credit. If the record shows that the Legislature acted generally for the best interest of the people, that it was saving of their money, that its legislation was calculated to be productive of beneficial results in the future, that upon the leading questions of the day its pulse beat in harmony with that of the body politic, that it responded to their appeals, and that while errors may have been committed, still if 99 100 per cent. of what it did was good, then I rely upon the people to praise and not damn it.

Its Record.

The annual appropriation for a session of the Legislature is \$90,000.

The session of—	
1867	\$78,645 10
1868	84,682 60
1869	87,235 20
1870	90,237 91
1871	90,486 60
1872	84,768 88
1873	77,865 62

Thus showing, with two exceptions, it to have been the least expensive for the past twelve years.

This, in face of the fact that when the Legislature met there was nearly \$700,000 in money in the treasury, and many said it will take the advice of the member from "Mad Springs" and "Reno" the treasury. The passage of the bill by this Legislature repealing all matters relating to copying into an appendix the annual reports of State officers, and public documents, will save the State from \$3,000 to \$5,000 at the next session, heretofore always included as legislative expenses.

In the appropriation bill a saving of several thousand dollars was made by cutting down the amounts usually allowed for clerical services. Next I desire to call attention to the bills passed relating to the State and Territorial indebtedness.

When the Legislature convened January 6th, 1879, the bonded debt of the State was \$540,400, to-wit:

Territorial bonds, interest 9% per cent., redeemable March 1st, 1887	\$380,000
State bonds, interest 10 per cent., redeemable April 1st, 1881	74,100
State bonds, interest 9% per cent., redeemable March 1st, 1882	86,000

Total \$540,400

There was in the various funds, in U. S. 6 per cent. bonds, the sum of \$410,500, which had been bore in by the Government and which bore no interest after September 1st, 1878. Apportioned as follows:

State school fund	\$186,000
State interest and sinking f'd.	100,000
Territorial int. and sinking f'd	100,000
State University fund	14,500

Total \$380,500

The amount in the State school fund, under the law, could only be invested in U. S. securities or Nevada State bonds. The amount in the State interest and sinking fund in U. S. 6 per cent. securities or California 6 per cent. State bonds. The amount in the Territorial interest and sinking fund, in U. S. securities. The amount in the State University fund, in U. S. securities and Nevada State bonds.

The financial officers of the State, finding that no California State bonds were obtainable and no U. S. securities bearing a higher rate of interest than 4 per cent., opened a correspondence with the holders of the Territorial bonds (\$380,000) and effected an agreement for the surrender of said bonds at such a rate of premium as would afford the State 4 1/2 per cent. interest during the life of the bonds (8 years) on the amount invested, provided the Legislature would pass an Act authorizing the investment and purchase at that rate of interest. The Legislature promptly passed an Act giving the necessary authority; also an Act authorizing the purchase of the State bonds proper in the State school fund (amount \$104,000) with the money and securities in the State interest and sinking fund.

The \$410,500 U. S. 6 per cent. bonds, and \$57,000 U. S. 4 per cent. bonds belonging to the Territorial interest and sinking fund, and \$23,000 U. S. 4 per cent. bonds belonging to the State school fund, were sold at par and apportioned to the proper funds.

The purchase of the State bonds in the State school fund was then made by paying out of the State interest and sinking fund \$107,745 32, being the face of the bonds (\$104,000) and the premium (\$3,745 32) originally paid for said bonds.

Then there was transferred, in accordance with law, from the State school fund to the Territorial interest and sinking fund the sum of \$325,000, with which amount and the sum of \$175,000 in Territorial interest and sinking fund, by law appropriated for the purpose, the purchase of the Territorial bonds was effected as follows:

On 1st of February, 1879	\$160,000
On 1st of April, 1879	220,000

Total \$380,000

In illustration of the computations made, the interest on \$160,000, at 9 1/2 per cent., from February 1st, 1879, the time of purchase, to March 1st, 1887, time of maturity of bonds, would be \$122,938 67. Add the principal, \$160,000, and the value of bonds and interest at maturity would amount to \$282,938 67.

For the \$220,000 there was paid the sum of \$207,415 27. The interest on this sum at 4 1/2 per cent. from date of purchase to maturity of bonds will be \$75,449 40, making the value of bonds and interest at maturity \$332,865 67.

The interest on \$220,000 at 9 1/2 per cent. from April 1st, 1879, the time of purchase, to March 1st, 1887, the time of maturity of bonds would be \$165,453 33. Add principal, \$220,000, and the value of bonds and interest at maturity would be \$385,453 33.

For the \$320,000 there was paid the sum of \$284,208 91. The interest on this sum at 4 1/2 per cent. from date of purchase to maturity of bonds will be \$101,249 42, making the value of bonds and interest at maturity \$385,453 33.

Total amount paid for Territorial bonds, \$491,627 18; interest at 4 1/2 per cent. to March 1st, 1887, \$176,697 82; value of bonds with interest at maturity, \$668,325.

The saving to the State by the purchase of these bonds is the difference between the rate of interest, four per cent. of U. S. bonds, purchasable, and the rate, four and a half per cent., allowed in the purchase of these bonds, on the amount of the purchase money from date of purchase to date of maturity of bonds, or as follows:

Interest on \$207,415 27 at 4 1/2 per cent. from Feb. 1st, 1879 to March 1st, 1887	\$ 8383 16
Interest on \$224,208 91 at 1/2 per cent. from April 1st, 1879 to March 1st, 1887	11240 91

Total saving to State \$19,633 10

In consideration of the amount appropriated (\$325,000) belonging to the State School Fund, a bond for \$30,000 not redeemable or transferable, drawing 5 per cent interest, was placed in the State School Fund, the interest to go into the General School Fund for the benefit of the public schools of the State.

The interest will amount to \$19,000 per annum, or \$190 more than would have been the interest derived from the four per cent. securities and the \$104,000 State bonds.

The effect of the whole transaction will be this: The amount (\$325,000) taken from the State school fund will not have to be raised by taxation in the next eight years to provide for the redemption of the bonds at maturity—as would have been the case had the purchase not been made; and which would have necessitated a tax of 20 cents on the \$100 of all taxable property in the State including the net proceeds of mines.

Now, instead of a 20-cent tax, a 5 or 3 1/2-cent tax will be sufficient to pay interest and the bonds in the State school fund, and instead of paying tribute to the Shylocks of Frankfurt on the Rhine the amount raised by this tax will be returned to the people of the State for the education of their children.

The State debt now outstanding is \$350,400 in State bonds bearing interest at the rate of 10 per cent. per annum and redeemable April 1st, 1881. To provide for their payment at maturity there is in the State interest and sinking fund \$50,000 in 6 per cent. California State bonds; consequently the State Debt is merely nominal.

Under this kind of thing also by the

into consideration the bill reducing the rate of State taxation from 90 to 55 cents. The outlook was anything but bright; the bonanzas were producing but little, and the conviction was inevitable that the State would not receive much from the tax on the net proceeds of the mines. It was unsafe to base the tax receipts upon a total valuation of over \$55,000,000. Acting upon this presumption the rate was placed at 55 cents upon the \$100, as against 90, the rate in force for the four years past. Most of the money legislation of the session hinged upon this rate, there being a universal desire that the rate should be placed at the very lowest figure compatible with public interest, and still preserve the State on a cash basis. The people were not only given the benefit of the vast sum that had accumulated, but in view of the outlook, the rate was made as low as possible. And thus in 1879 and 1880 the taxpayers will have \$245,000 less to pay in taxes, than would have been the case had the rate remained undisturbed. The Legislature did but its duty; nevertheless it is deserving of credit and not abuse for it.

"The Chinese Must Go."

In both the Republican and Democratic platforms were planks relating to the Chinese. Now let me recite to you the action of the Legislature upon this subject.

The Anti-Chinese bill was pending before Congress when the Legislature convened. Immediately a joint resolution was passed asking Congress to pass that bill.

After it had passed Congress, another resolution was pushed through returning thanks to Senator Sargent, and all others who aided him, in securing its passage.

Following this the Legislature quickly passed another resolution, directed to President Hayes, requesting him to sign the bill.

After the veto, still another was passed thanking Senator Blaine for his noble advocacy of it, and the Illinois Legislature, in session at the time, having directed its Representatives to vote for the bill, Nevada, through the Legislature, returned its thanks, by resolution, to the Illinois Legislature, for what it had done in the premises.

Having done all it could to secure National help, the Legislature then turned its attention at home, and in order that the people might have an opportunity to more clearly express their sentiments, it enacted a law for taking the sense of the voters at the next general election by permitting them to vote "For" or "Against" Chinese Immigration. This bill provides for the canvass of the votes according to law and the transmission of the result by the Governor, in the shape of a memorial from the people of the State of Nevada to the President and Vice President of the United States, each member of the Cabinet, United States Senate and House of Representatives. The responsibility now rests upon the voters of the State to show by their ballots their opinion as to the advisability of admitting to fellowship with free labor, the evils of slave labor.

The Act to prevent the propagation and spread of contagious diseases was aimed at the Chinese, intended to harass and if possible in any way make it apparent that their obnoxious customs were very objectionable. This bill makes it a misdemeanor for any person to remove or disinter dead bodies without first obtaining leave of the Board of Commissioners; the penalty being a fine of \$300 or \$500, or imprisonment for from six to twelve months. And the Board is prohibited from giving permission for the removal or disinterment of the dead from contagious diseases.

So careful was the Legislature that in the Act which it passed to authorize and empower aliens and non-resident persons and corporations to take, hold, and enjoy and acquire real estate in the State, that there was a provision inserted, that the Chinese should be excepted from the benefits of the Act.

Going still further there was passed an act to prohibit the employment of Chinese and Mongolians in certain cases. This bill prohibits the employment of Chinese on public works or in the construction of any public works, by any railroad or other corporation, shall be granted except upon the express condition that no "heathen Chinese" shall be employed.

This was followed by the passage of an act entitled "An Act to prevent slavery or involuntary servitude, unless for the punishment of crimes," which recited that:

WHEREAS, all Chinese who come to this coast, arrive here under a contract to labor for a term of years, and are bound by such contract not only by the superstition of their peculiar religious, but leaving their blood relations, fathers, mothers, sisters, brothers or cousins as hostages in China for the fulfillment of their part of the contract; and

WHEREAS, such slave labor and involuntary servitude is opposed to the genius of our institutions, opposed to the prevailing spirit of the age, as well as to humanity and Christianity, and degrades the dignity of labor which is the foundation of republic institutions; and

WHEREAS, Section Seventeen of Article One of the Constitution of the State of Nevada reads as follows: "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, unless for the punishment of crimes, shall ever be tolerated in this State." Therefore

The people of the State of Nevada, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. The immigration to this State of all slaves and other people bound by contract to involuntary servitude for a term of years is hereby prohibited.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any company, person or persons to collect the wages or compensation for the labor of the persons described in the first section of this Act.

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for any corporation, company, person or persons, to pay to any owner, or agent of the owner of any such persons mentioned in Section One of this Act, any wages or compensation for the slaves or persons so bound by said contract to involuntary servitude.

SEC. 4. Any violation of any of the provisions of this Act, shall be deemed a misdemeanor, and shall be punished by a fine of not less than three hundred dollars, or by imprisonment in the county jail for a term of not less than three months, nor more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

And finally in addition to all of these was the stringent law enacted to regulate the sale of opium and to prohibit the keeping of places of resort for smoking or otherwise using that drug, intended to not only effect a reformation morally, but also to destroy, if possible, the lucrative business enjoyed in this branch by this detestable class.

The Railroad Question.

In the Republican platform were incorporated these planks on this subject: Resolved, That it is the duty of Congress to perfect with all possible expedition such legislation as will secure to the country the benefit of honest and fair adjustment of freights and fares on all railroads, whose construction is the result of land grants, subsidies, loans, and other Government aid assistance.

Resolved, That the Republican party favors and demands at the hands of the State Legislature legislation having in view the regulation and equalization of freights and fares on the railroads within this State.

In the Democratic platform there was the following:

In view of the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, State and National legislation is demanded to protect the people of Nevada from the outrageous discrimination and excessive charges of railroad corporations within this State.

Now what was done by the Legislature?

First—The passage of a joint resolution instructing Senators Jones and Sharon to vote for and use all honorable means to secure the passage of the Reagan bill, the then exciting measure.

Second—Monopolizing Congress to protect the people of Nevada, and those going from or coming to the State against discrimination by the Central Pacific Railroad in the matter of fares and freights, and recommending the enactment of the so-called Reagan bill as an alleviation. One thousand copies of this memorial were ordered printed, and sent to the members of Congress, and to the various Departments in Washington.

Third—When Senator Sharon presented this memorial to the Senate, he announced his intention of obeying the instructions contained therein, and the Legislature immediately telegraphed the gratification of that body at his determination to support the Reagan bill.

Fourth—The idea became general that the Reagan bill was to be smothered by the sub-committee to which it had been referred, and the Legislature passed a joint resolution instructing our Senators to call for a report from the U. S. Senate select committee, and to use strenuous endeavors to have the bill placed on its final passage.

Fifth—The anti-discrimination principle in the Reagan bill being considered good, the Legislature determined to apply it to this State, and the so-called Williams discrimination bill, as it now stands as a law on our statutes is an exact copy of the Reagan bill. The main feature in it is the "discrimination" portion, and the railroads are now compelled to treat all alike. But this bill also requires the posting of schedules, showing the rates charged, and the rates can not be changed only upon five days notice being given. As we proceed on this subject the importance of this proviso will become apparent.

For years there had been on the books a statute requiring railroad companies to make annual reports, but it never was complied with, because there was no penalty attached. The law was a dead letter. This Legislature reenacted the law, and affixed a penalty of \$500 for each days negligence after failure to report as provided by the law.

It also passed another act proscribing a penalty of \$2,000 if any railroad company or its agent should violate or attempt to violate any of the State laws regulating fares and freights on railroads within this State.

It was undoubtedly the wish of the people that laws should be enacted correcting the abuses and preventing the discriminations which were being practiced by railroads companies doing business in this State, and it was the honest desire of a great majority of the members of the Legislature to enact such laws, as is abundantly proved by the passage of the Williams bill and the resolution of instruction before referred to. But the problem of "regulating fares and freights" was one of the greatest difficulty. The members were generally without experience, and this inexperience, added to the almost insuperable difficulties surrounding the question, cost of construction, cost of operating, distance of carriage, character of freight and amount of business, rendered the consummation of their desire almost impossible. But great as the difficulties of the subject legitimately were they were increased and made more complicated by the intemperate zeal and simulated anxiety for the popular welfare manifested by certain interested parties and self-constituted champions, who, assuming superior knowledge and affecting superior patriotism undertook the labor of preparing the necessary bills for laws and then offensively assumed their methods superior to all others and insolently demanded their passage by the Legislature without amendment or qualification, assuming and asserting

that all who disagreed with the proposed methods or preferred others, were coerced by the power or corrupted by the money of the railroads. Pot-house politicians without principles and destitute of character, professional lobbyists who were and always have been in the pay of monopolists and venal scribblers combined with certain great local interests in Storey County to coerce the enactment of particular laws without regard to their fitness or justice, no matter how bad in principle, no matter how unjust to railroads, no matter how injurious to other localities than Storey County, no matter how oppressive to other interests than the particular interests sought to be bolstered.

I know as does every intelligent man who was present at Carson last Winter that there never was a time when a vast majority of the Legislature was not willing and anxious to pass a law reducing the rates of freight and fare to a standard that would be just to the companies and fair to the people. I know as does every intelligent man in the State that such legislation was obstructed if not prevented by the bad men and bad motives and unjust measures already alluded to. It is a great mistake to suppose that the Lewis and Woodburn bills were defeated because of any opposition to the reasonable and just regulation of freights and fares, or because the Legislature in any manner belonged to the railroad companies. The Lewis bill passed the House without a dissenting vote and was only defeated in the Senate after its distinguished author had expressed doubts of its constitutionality, after it had been condemned by the Attorney General of the State, and when no respectable lawyer could be found who did not condemn it as utterly vicious and in the face of the fundamental law, and then only that other and less objectionable legislation having in view the same general purpose might be brought forward and passed.

No man to-day but entertains a rational doubt that the Lewis bill was an abortive attempt to regulate commerce between the States, a thing which Congress alone can do. No man believes if it had passed it could have been enforced and every fair minded man must admit that it was the duty of the Legislature to defeat it for its illegality if not for the complexity of its provisions.

The Woodburn bill fixed the limit at 10 cents per ton per mile for all freight, except that 5 cents was the rate for wood, salt, iron, lumber, and other articles specially named. The laws in force allowed a maximum of 20 cents per ton per mile. While it is true that the Woodburn bill would have greatly benefited Virginia City, it is not so apparent that the rate allowed would have enabled the V. & T. R. R. to have been operated so as to return a fair investment on the actual value of the property. The Woodburn bill was not fair to the Eureka and Palisade road. This road was built by private capital and cost \$1,600,000. It has only been in operation a few years, and is dependent upon the stability of Eureka as a mining camp. When it was built, stage fare was \$20, and freight \$30 to \$40 per ton. This road charges \$8 for fare, and as a general rule \$18 per ton for freight; \$18 is the full limit of 20 cents per ton per mile. If the Woodburn bill had become a law these prices would have been reduced one-half, and it was argued that such prices would not have allowed a reasonable return for the outlay which had been made.

But the main objection to the Woodburn bill was that such restrictive legislation would effectually prohibit, at once, and forever, the building of any new railroads in this State. Austin wanted connection with Battle Mountain, and was perfectly willing to pay the maximum rates of 10 cents per mile for passengers, and 20 cents per mile per ton for freight. Why? Because even at the maximum rates fare would be \$0 by rail, as against \$15 by stage; and \$18 per ton for freight by rail, as against \$35 and \$40 paid by teams. It was believed that the railroad would be built, but not at the maximum in the Woodburn bill became the law. Hence the Lynder delegation were naturally opposed to any reduction of the maximum of 10 and 20 cents.

The proposed Bodie road interested Lyon and Esmeralda counties. But under the terms in the Woodburn bill there was no danger of its being constructed. The truth is that, in our lifetime, the Woodburn bill being a law, Nevada would have no more local railroads. If Reno wanted a direct road to Virginia, or Reno or Winnemucca wanted to build to Oregon, or Tuscarora desired connection with the Central Pacific, or White Pine, Lincoln or Nye counties, should hope for the E. & P. to be extended, capital would never embark in the enterprises, at the rates referred to. Therefore the Woodburn bill, more particularly of benefit to Virginia, would have been detrimental to other rights and interests of the State at large. I voted for the Woodburn bill at every stage of its proceedings. The bill did not suit me at the time, but in deference to what appeared to be a great and earnest appeal I did so vote. Study of the subject since, convinces me that the bill ought not to have become a law.

Yet the action of the Legislature upon the railroad question has pointed out to my mind ideas of practical legislation for the future, if demanded by the people, which will operate for the benefit of all sections alike. I present them: Take the schedules called for in the Williams bill (each road having its own) and pass a law saying that the rates so charged shall be reduced — per cent. If this works any injustice, classify the roads according to their business, and having their own classification to go by,

say the rates shall be — per cent. less than charged on a certain day. By doing this every road can be regulated properly, and yet the present maximum remain undisturbed, so that new roads can be built, if they are wanted.

A dozen other railroad bills were introduced during the session. And while the Legislature failed to regulate fares and freights, because of the difficulties named, STILL IT DID DO MORE FOR THE PEOPLE UPON THIS QUESTION THAN ALL THE OTHER LEGISLATURES OF THE STATE PUT TOGETHER.

The Salary Bill.

The Legislature is certainly deserving of everlasting credit for the passage of the Salary bill, which takes effect on the first Monday in January, 1881. Under the fee system the cost to the counties of this State is about \$1,010,000 per annum, nearly four times as much as the cost of the State Government. In Storey county for the years 1877-78 the officers received in salaries and fees the enormous sum of \$265,173 33. Of this sum \$185,736 44 was net. Gross per year, \$122,586 16; net, \$92,888 22. Under the Salary bill the salaries for Storey county will be about \$60,000, leaving \$33,000 profit to be applied to other expenses. But under this bill there will be no more deputies than are absolutely necessary to perform the work, and the expenses ought not to be by \$20,000, what is now paid. It is safe to say a saving of \$50,000 per year will be made to the taxpayers of Storey. The natural legitimate receipts to Storey from licenses, fines, docket fees, poll taxes and the proceeds of the mines is at least \$90,000 per year. Add to this the \$50,000 already stated and we have \$140,000 to pay current expenses. But an estimate of these show that including the \$60,000 for salaries, and \$78,000 for schools, it will require \$228,517 66 to run Storey county per year. So the balance will have to be made up by taxation; the law requires 15 cents for school purposes, but the additional levy need be so little, if the county is properly managed, that for all practical purposes it may be urged that no county tax will be necessary; at the best it ought to be trifling compared with what has been paid in the past. Herewith I present tables upon which these remarks are presented:

Following is a summary of the receipts of the several offices for two years, 1877-78, in Storey county:

	Gross.	Net.
Assessor's office	\$41,119 57	\$32,949 52
Sherriff's office	20,074 00	15,474 08
County Clerk's office	38,18 15	14,318 15
Recorder and Auditor's	18,343 34	7,903 34
Deputy Attorney's office	20,000 00	20,000 00
Treasurer's office	11,000 00	11,000 00
Coroner & Pub. Admin.	2,430 98	2,430 98
J. P. Ace Township No. 1	17,944 45	10,744 45
J. P. Ace Township No. 2	12,200 47	7,200 47
J. P. Ace Township No. 3	8,949 19	7,149 19
Constable's office No. 1	10,884 11	10,884 11
Constable's office No. 2	14,500 00	14,500 00
Constable's office No. 3	6,474 60	4,074 60
Dist. Judge's salary	14,000 00	14,000 00
State and County salary	5,000 00	5,000 00
Hospital Physician's sal.	8,400 00	8,400 00
Co. Commis's salary	6,700 00	6,700 00

Total \$265,173 33 \$185,736 44

OTHER RECEIPTS.

Sherry License	\$3,170 66
Gaming License	9,400 00
Fines and Forfeitures	14,318 15
Toll roads	76 74
Docket fees	1,238 00
Hospital accounts pay. paid	3,075 70
Insurance premiums	2,161 69
Poll tax	8,600 00

Total \$54,880 90

Net Proceeds of Mines \$130,224 00

Total \$185,113 00

EXPENDITURES FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1878.

Indigent accounts	\$10,668 75
Election expenses	5,537 69
Jail expenses	1,238 00
Hospital account	26,384 87
Contingent acct's (miscel's acct's)	25,453 75
Beet and seed	2,631 50
Stationery and furniture	1,681 83
Jury fees	5,228 70
Printing and advertising	1,417 00
Wood and coal sec't	1,313 22
Interest acct	78 00
Schools	78 00

Total \$108,511 08

In Washoe county it may be safely said there will be no county tax, or so low a rate in comparison with what it has been that the taxpayers will be astonished at the reduction.

In other counties a great reduction will be sure to follow, while no county in the State, to say the least, will be any worse off than it was before.

The point sought to be obtained by this bill is to give people good officers at a fixed compensation; but for the taxpayers to have the benefit of the vast sums paid in fees, instead of a few office holders.

The Penalty Bill.

Many taxpayers have expressed disapproval at the passage of the bill dubbed "The Penalty Bill," and which relieved the California and Consolidated Virginia Mining Companies from certain tax penalties alleged to have accrued to the State and Storey county. These companies desiring to test the constitutionality of the so-called bullion tax law, refused to pay their taxes, and the matter was taken to the United States Supreme Court. Here several years would have elapsed before a decision could be reached, and while everybody believed the State and county would

